

**REMARKS**

Applicants have amended the specification to remove references therein to a specific claim and to correct a typographical error. No new matter is involved.

Applicants have also amended independent Claims 1 and 4 to clarify the present invention.

As now amended, independent Claim 1 is to an electric wire that has an electrically conductive core wire and a coating consisting of polyvinyl chloride for coating the core wire. A mark is formed on a part of an outer surface of the coating by allowing an oil-soluble coloring agent to adhere to the part, and a coating layer is formed on the mark and the outer surface of the coating, the coating layer coating the mark. The coating layer consists of polyvinylalcohol. Claim 4 is to a similar electric wire where the coating layer consists of an ethylene-vinylalcohol copolymer. Such electric wires are not taught or suggested in the prior art.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious in view of a combination of Brown (U.S. 2,992,292) and Newton et al. (U.S. 6,173,100); and Claims 4-6 were rejected as obvious in view of a combination of Brown and Itoh et al. (2003/0194573). Reconsideration and removal of those rejections are respectfully requested in view of the present amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

With respect to Claims 1-3, the Office Action alleges that Brown shows a coating of a synthetic resin on a core wire, a mark on the outer surface of the resin coating and a coating layer formed over the mark and outer surface of the coating of synthetic resin. It is admitted that Brown does not disclose a coating layer of PVA but Newton is cited to disclose a cable having a coating

layer (12 ) of PVA, and it is alleged that it would be obvious to use the PVA coating of Newton to cover the Brown resin coating and mark. The thicknesses of Claims 2 and 3 are alleged to be merely optimum or workable ranges.

A study of Brown shows that that reference uses a coating of a silicone rubber on a core wire and a coating of silicone resin over a pigment indicia on the silicone rubber coating. The indicia formed on the silicone rubber coating is a pigment which does not penetrate into the silicone rubber coating but merely adheres to the surface thereof. The indicia is formed by a high melting non-penetrating pigment and is preferably of high melting oxides or carbon black.

In Newton, the PVA is in the form of a tape, with the PVA layer disposed between a lower layer (14) and upper layer (16), which layers are formed of a spun bonded non-woven polyester material, although other materials can be used (see Col. 3, lines 46-63). This is completely distinct from the outer coating in the present claims.

In the present invention, different resins are used in Claims 1-3, a PVC resin coating on the core wire and a PVA outer coating. Also, the mark formed on the PVC resin coating is formed by an oil-soluble coloring agent that penetrates or securely adheres to the PVC resin coating and, as such, resists passage through the PVA outer coating. The use of a silicone resin, as in Brown, in the present invention as an outer coating is ineffectual, as shown in Comparative Example C of Table I of Applicants' specification. Claim 1 has been amended to specify that the coating on the wire is polyvinyl chloride, that the coloring agent forming the mark is an oil-soluble coloring agent that adheres to the part of the outer surface of the coating and that the coating layer formed on the mark

consists of polyvinylalcohol. This combination provides the unobvious benefits as described in the present specification.

With respect to Claims 4-6, the Brown and Itoh et al. references also fail to teach or suggest the present claimed electric wire. Brown is discussed above. Itoh et al. is cited to show use of a multilayer structure comprising a polymer layer consisting of EVA. The reference by the Office Action to paragraph 0039 of Itoh et al. merely shows EVA as one of many polymer films usable in a multilayer wiring board. One would not be led to combine those teachings with Brown, absent first reading Applicants' specification. The above remarks relative to Claims 1-3 are also applicable to the rejection of Claims 4-6. The Claims 4-6, as now amended provide specific features not present in or suggested by the references.

In view of the present amendment to Claims 1 and 4, and the above remarks, Claims 1-6 are believed to be patentable over the prior art and early action towards allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,  
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP



William G. Kratz, Jr.  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 22,631

WGK/bak

Atty. Docket No. 050397  
Suite 1000, 1725 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE